

## Compher, Michael

---

**From:** Siegel, Kathryn  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 16, 2022 12:15 PM  
**To:** Compher, Michael; Hulting, Melissa; Cain, Alexis  
**Cc:** Fuoco, Marta  
**Subject:** RE: City of Chicago Health Impact Assessment Meeting Summary

Michael, I had the same questions.. We're hoping to meet with the city next week to regroup and talk next steps. ARP monitoring will definitely be on the agenda. Stay tuned.

---

**From:** Compher, Michael <compher.michael@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 16, 2022 10:46 AM  
**To:** Siegel, Kathryn <siegel.kathryn@epa.gov>; Hulting, Melissa <hulting.melissa@epa.gov>; Cain, Alexis <cain.alexis@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Fuoco, Marta <fuoco.marta@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: City of Chicago Health Impact Assessment Meeting Summary

Thanks Katie. Any ideas about what ARP funding is being referenced below for setting up air monitors? Did the City already receive ARP funding from the Fed, or is this possibly in reference to the OAR competitive funds? I know ARP was provided in many different streams, so maybe they already have funding to support these efforts. Either way, we should probably be engaged in the planning for the monitoring and offer our technical assistance, unless this is part of their proposal being developed for the RFP.

cc-ing Marta for her awareness.

-Michael

---

**From:** Siegel, Kathryn <siegel.kathryn@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 16, 2022 10:34 AM  
**To:** Compher, Michael <compher.michael@epa.gov>; Hulting, Melissa <hulting.melissa@epa.gov>; Cain, Alexis <cain.alexis@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: City of Chicago Health Impact Assessment Meeting Summary

FYI

---

**From:** Beckmann, Ronna Erin <beckmann.ronna@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 16, 2022 8:29 AM  
**To:** Shore, Debra <Shore.Debra@epa.gov>; Katims, Casey <Katims.Casey@epa.gov>; Mooney, John <Mooney.John@epa.gov>; Kelley, Jeff <kelley.jeff@epa.gov>; Rowan, Anne <rowan.anne@epa.gov>; Singer, Joshua <Singer.Joshua@epa.gov>; Saucedo, Alfred <Saucedo.Alfred@epa.gov>; Conger, Nick <Conger.Nick@epa.gov>; Hamilton, Lindsay <Hamilton.Lindsay@epa.gov>; Geller, Andrew <Geller.Andrew@epa.gov>; Barzyk, Timothy <Barzyk.Timothy@epa.gov>; Hoffman, Joel <Hoffman.Joel@epa.gov>; Engelman-Lado, Marianne <EngelmanLado.Marianne@epa.gov>; Dorka, Lilian <Dorka.Lilian@epa.gov>; Bowles, Jack <Bowles.Jack@epa.gov>; Newton, Cheryl <Newton.Cheryl@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Walts, Alan <walts.alan@epa.gov>; Furey, Eileen <furey.eileen@epa.gov>; Siegel, Kathryn <siegel.kathryn@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** City of Chicago Health Impact Assessment Meeting Summary

Good morning – We wanted to share a summary of last night’s public meeting. I’ve also copied a Brett Chase Sun-Times article at the end of this email. And the City has a meeting summary and a copy of its presentation here:

<https://www.chicago.gov/city/en/sites/rmg-expansion/home/health-impact-assessment.html>.

-----

On February 15, the Chicago Department of Public Health hosted its third and last public engagement session related to the City’s development of a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) for the proposed Southside Recycling facility in Southeast Chicago. Megan Cunningham, Managing Deputy CDPH Commissioner, led the presentation, with support from Jeff Harrington from Tetra Tech.

Megan stated that the City plans to make a **decision on the permit by the end of the week**, and that the HIA and supporting documentation will all be available by the end of the month.

The primary purpose of the meeting was for CDPH to present the findings of the HIA. Megan covered a lot of ground, so what’s below are the highlights.

Megan explained that the HIA evaluated the impacts of the proposed facility on three factors: Quality of Life, Environment, and Health. And within each factor, the HIA rated the impact of the proposed facility. For example, within “Environment,” they would expect a positive benefit to the City from recycling, but a negative impact from air pollution (even with the planned controls).

To inform the “Health” factor, Jeff Harrington explained that Tetra Tech used the Human Health Risk Assessment model to analyze the impact of the proposed facility on human health. The HHRA evaluated three exposure pathways: breathing, eating, and touching. And it looked at both cancer-causing and non-carcinogenic compounds (both acute and chronic exposures). **Tetra Tech concluded that the exposure risks for all of these pathways were below EPA benchmarks.** Jeff Harrington noted that the model provides for an overestimate of cancer risk, so they are confident in the findings.

After presenting on the three factors, Megan addressed whether the **adverse impacts could be sufficiently mitigated – the City explicitly listed mitigation as a factor in its permit decision.** The City looked at not just the company’s current commitments, but what else could be put in place to reduce the negative impacts, such as traffic/street conditions, noise, and explosions/fires. She noted that the mitigations could not address expanding industrial use.

Megan also discussed HIA recommendations to promote health and racial equity beyond Southside Recycling. **Three future initiatives** stood out:

- The City plans to use ARP funding to install **new air monitoring sites**, including on the Southeast Side. The City has heard from the community that this is a priority.
- The City plans to use ARP funding to complete a **large-scale cumulative impact assessment** beginning in the next few months and completed in the next few years. They seek to institutionalize the use of cumulative impacts tools into policy.
- The City plans to create an **“Office of Health Equities”** which will expand and enhance the use of health and racial equity impact assessments in decision-making. They plan to include community stakeholders in this effort.

Megan several times acknowledged EPA’s input, including with the air quality monitoring report and the selection of the Human Health Risk Assessment model.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Megan and Jeff responded to questions that participants submitted during the meeting. Unlike the first meeting, the submitted questions and comments were not visible to participants, and Megan committed the City to responding to unanswered questions. After the first meeting, many felt that having a visible comments feed was distracting and raised tensions during the meeting.

Please let us know if you have any questions. And please share this with anyone I've missed.

Ronna Beckmann  
External Communications Office  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5  
312-886-0689  
[beckmann.ronna@epa.gov](mailto:beckmann.ronna@epa.gov)

<https://chicago.suntimes.com/2022/2/15/22936651/general-iron-southeast-side-metal-shredder-permit-rmg>

## **Decision on Southeast Side metal shredder permit expected this week**

City health officials said Tuesday night they plan to release a report that outlines the environmental, health and quality of life impacts of adding another source of pollution to an industrial area.

By [Brett Chase](#) Feb 15, 2022, 8:57pm CST



The fate of a proposed Southeast Side metal shredder is expected to be decided by the end of this week when city health officials release a report that outlines the environmental, health and quality of life impacts of adding another source of pollution to a community that already suffers from poor air quality.

An online presentation Tuesday night by a city health official and a city-hired consultant ran through a check list of positives and negatives of allowing the relocated and rebuilt business

formerly known as General Iron to open at East 116th Street along the Calumet River. Among the positives: recycling junked metals and more than 100 jobs. Negatives included additional air pollution and “potential explosions,” officials said

The facility, which is built but sitting idle waiting for a final city operating permit, has been a highly contentious issue between residents and Mayor Lori Lightfoot, who last year agreed to conduct a community health impact assessment at the request of President Joe Biden’s top environmental official.

Megan Cunningham, managing deputy commissioner of the city’s public health department, suggested that tougher rules by the city could be put in place to reduce the added pollution if the scrap metal operation is allowed to operate. The business potentially adds to soil and water pollution and poses risks for fires and explosions, she said.

Consultant Jeff Harrington of the engineering firm Tetra Tech said his modeling analysis concluded that there would not be an increased cancer risk in the area, though Cunningham noted that the nearby communities of East Side, Hegewisch and South Deering all have high for rates of cancer compared with the city as a whole.

Cunningham didn’t tip her hand as to which way the city was leaning on the permit but did say that health officials were considering the totality of polluting industries nearby.